



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/558,008	04/24/2000	Hannu Honkala	930.36US01	7672

32294 7590 09/30/2003

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.  
14TH FLOOR  
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT  
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182

EXAMINER

D AGOSTA, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/558,008

Applicant(s)

HONKALA ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen M. D'Agosta

Art Unit

2683

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 31 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 1-21.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1. The applicant argues there is no motivation for use of multiple gateways, yet it is known in the art for computing hardware/software to be centralized or distributed (eg. mainframe processing vs. client server). Secondly, the examiner pointed out that multiplexers and gateways/gatekeepers work in similar ways as described in the application. The examiner also provided prior art, Wynn Quon that has multiple interfaces/gateways for different types of systems and data (eg. computer user sent to phone user) which reads on the claim. Lastly, the examiner points out that a "gateway" is known in the art as providing translational capabilities between two disparate networks. 2. Portions of the argument (ending on page 7) deal with the design of the gateway(s) and their interconnections which is not novel in the examiner's view since Wynn Quon teaches multiple interfaces/gateways which can be one (or more) hardware devices - hence the user ultimately has the decision as to if the system should be ONE gateway (saves cost) or Multiple gateways (more cost, no singlepoint of failure). 3. The applicant argues that the prior art does not disclose gateways arranged to separate first/second traffic types or second gateway arranged to extract first type of traffic and output the extracted information to the first gateway and first gateway with output interface to transmit second type of traffic dependent upon the extracted data. The examiner disagrees - again, this is a design decision which is found in the prior art cited - Wynn Quon teaches multiple interfaces/gateways that MUST extract data and pass it to the second interface/gateway for transmission on a different network which reads on these claims. The examiner notes that the main purpose of a gateway is to translate between two disparate systems, the actual selection of ONE gateway to support several systems OR the selection of MULTIPLE gateways to support said several systems is a user-specified design consideration and is not novel.



WILLIAM TROST  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600